offence under the Breach of Contract Act is not extraditable. Especially at the present time of increased construction of works the contractors require some hold on the labourers.

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao observed that the Indian Planters were in favour of the introduction of an Act on the lines of the Madras Planters' Labour Act.

Mr. S. Venkatesaiya pointed out that the Madras Act had its disadvantages also and that it was advantageous only to planters having large estates but not to those owning small ones. He said that cooly colonies and medical inspection were required before the benefits of the Act could be attained, and that they could not be adequately provided for by petty planters. He represented that the introduction of the Madras Act would bring in new complications and that if the present laws were more efficiently administered and complaints more speedily disposed of nothing more would be required. But if the offence could be made extraditable, he said that the Act might be introduced.

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao replied that the Madras Act was more humane and advantageous to both the planter and the cooly.

When the members present at the Assembly were asked they said that the Indian planters were generally in favour of introducing the Madras Act into Mysore.

Reply of Government.—The British Government will be addressed in the first instance and the matter then considered.

SUBJECT No. 3.

Press Regulation.

(*a*) Mr. S. Venkatesiah, Hassan District Agricultural and Industrial Association,

(*b*) Messrs. N. Bheema Rao, Chitaldrug municipality and C. Chennakesavaiya, Krishi Silpabhi Vardhaka Samaj, Chitaldrug; and

(*a*) *and* (*b*) Mr. B. Narasinga Rao, Seringapatam taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) As the country is peaceful and as the people are thoroughly loyal, it is requested that the Mysore Press Regulation be repealed in the interests of the country's intellectual advancement.

(*b*) If the Regulation cannot be repealed, it may be modified—

(i) by repealing Section 2 which requires the permission of Government for starting a paper,

(ii) by defining the various offences for which the editors and proprietors are liable to be punished,

(iii) by removing the punishment of deportation, and

(iv) by providing for a judicial trial by the Full Bench of the Chief Court.

Mr. Bheema Rao added that the occasion which gave rise to the introduction of the Press Law no longer existed, that times had changed, that there was no fear of sedition now and that the repeal of the law would lead to more healthy and vigorous criticism. He said that the existence

of the law had engendered vague fears and suspicions, and that even facts were not reported to the Press.

The Dewan asked whether any one had been brought to trouble unreasonably under the Press Law.

Mr. K. S. Krishna Iyer said that it was the fear of prosecution due to the existence of the Press Law that deterred people from writing to the papers. The lawyers did not take much interest in civic affairs and others were kept out of it through fear of the Press Law.

Mr. K. Krishnamurthy Rao said that on account of the Press Law information was not made available for Government or the public and that there was necessity for the Act when there was unrest in British India but that there was none now.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao said that there was no necessity even then for the enactment in question.

Mr. M. S. Ramachar said that the people were all loyal and that therefore there was no necessity to retain the Regulation in the Statute Book. Its repeal would be a boon conferred on the people for their loyalty.

Mr. D. Venkataramiah represented that correspondents were suspected. No communications of public interest are sent up by district correspondents; papers are not self-supporting and therefore no one ventures to start a paper. The restrictions should be removed and the Government orders relating to districts should be supplied to the Press.

Mr. Venkatakrishnaiya represented that newspapers would facilitate efficiency audit and that educative knowledge could be disseminated. He also said that the greater the number of newspapers the less would be the difficulties of Government.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration. Government wish to increase the circulation of newspapers in the State.

SUBJECT NO. 4.

Amendment of the Code of Civil Procedure.

(*a*) Messrs. Chik Ramanna and Byre Gowda, Kolar taluk.

(*b*) *and* (*c*) Messrs. A. Krishna Rao, Bar Association, Mysore.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) Plaintiffs are put to great loss when defendants apply for time and the distraint order becomes null and void. The Law may be amended in accordance with the old rules which were more useful and had greater operative authority.

(*b*) Order No. 21, Rule 57 of the Civil Procedure Code, may be amended by providing for the continuance of the attachment once made for a period of at least 3 years.

(*c*) The Civil Procedure Code may be amended by allowing suits against Government by private parties.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration.